

REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 8, 2004 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto. Claims 9-18 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added, and no new issues are raised which require further consideration and/or search. Claims 1-8 and 19-21 are submitted for consideration.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 15, 19, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,173,173 to Dean et al. The rejection is traversed as being based on a reference that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features clearly recited in independent claims 1, 19, 20 and 21. Claim 1, upon which claims 2-8 depend, recites a method for performing a detach of a terminal registered to a telecommunication network by associating an identification for the terminal, deriving a signature for the identification, and allocating a pair consisting of the identification and the signature to the terminal. The method includes the steps of sending a detach request including the identification and the identification signature from the registered terminal to the network and receiving the detach request at the network side. The method also includes the steps of comparing the received detach request with a record of registration data of the terminal kept at the network side and detaching the terminal from the network, if the received detach request coincides with the record of registration data.

Claim 19 recites a terminal device adapted to the method according to claim 1. Claim 20 recites a network controlling device adapted to the method according to claim

1. Claim 21 recites a telecommunication system consisting of at least one terminal and at least one network controlling device controlling at least one radio transceiver device, adapted to carry out the method according to claim 1.

As will be discussed below, the cited prior art reference of Dean et al. fails to disclose or suggest the elements of any of presently pending claims 1, 2, 6 19, 20 and 21.

Dean et al. teaches an enhanced kill call capability system where a plurality of vendor computers is linked with a mobile service center through a kill-call server. The vendor computers have means for detecting an invalid mobile call, preferably by monitoring RF fingerprints in the case of fraudulent calls by "clones" and by monitoring the remaining credit balance of metered, pre-paid calls. Col. 3, lines 17-32. The mobile service center includes an administrative call processing node for performing the actual call processing and a mobile center for enabling a technician interface to terminate an invalid call. When the technician interface is made, the request is validated before any affirmative action is taken. Once validation is complete, a tear down request message is formatted and sent to the administrative call processing node. The administrative call processing node determines if the call is active and forwards the message to the appropriate call database node. Once the call database node has completed its task, the results are forwarded to the client. Col. 3, line 45-Col. 4, line 10.

The technician interface includes the mobile ID number of the call that is to be torn down and an identifier for a kill-call command. Col. 5, lines 5-15. When a client request that a call be torn down, the server validates a connection request with the client

by obtaining the client's host name and IP address, and looking it up in a server table to verify that the client is authorized to perform call tear down. For security purposes a challenge is sent from the server to the client. The server uses the plain text password for the client as found in a flat file database along with the challenge to generate a signature for authentication. The client uses the challenge along with the shared secret password to create a signature and then sends the kill call request to the server with the client generated signature embedded in the request. The server compares the client generated signature with the server generated signature to verify that the client has authority to use the requested command. The kill call request is forwarded to the administrative call processing/data base node for actual tear down. Once the administrative call processing/data base node has completed its task, the kill call results are sent back and reformatted with the information defined in the protocol specification and returned to the client. Col. 7, line 24 – Col. 8, line 6.

Applicant submits that Dean et al. simply does not teach or suggest the features taught in each of claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 15, 19, 20 and 21. Claim 1, in part, recites performing a detach of a terminal registered to a telecommunication network by sending a detach request including the identification and the identification signature from the registered terminal to the network. Dean et al., on the other hand, is simply directed to tearing down fraudulent calls in the mobile home market of the mobile telephone service subscriber. Col. 3, lines 1-9 of Dean et al. Dean et al. does not teach or suggest detaching a registered terminal from a network as recited in claim 1. Even though Dean

et al. may tear down a call, since there is no suggestion or discussion in Dean et al. of detaching a registered terminal from a network, the terminal initiating the fraudulent call in Dean et al. may remain registered with and attached to the network. Therefore, according to the teaching of Dean et al., a new call can be initiated by the same terminal immediately after a previous call from that terminal has been “killed.” Claim 1 also recites sending a detach request including the identification and the identification signature from the registered terminal to the network. According to Dean et al., when a tear down request is received, the server (1) validates a connection request by obtaining the client’s host name and IP address and looking up the host name and IP address in a server table to verify that the client is authorized to perform call tear down; (2) generates a signature created from a server generated challenge and the plain text password for the client; and (3) compares the server generated signature with the client generated signature received in the request from the client. There is no teaching in Dean et al. of sending a detach request which includes both the identification and the identification signature from the registered terminal to the network, wherein the detach request is compared with a registration record and the terminal is detached if the received detach request matches the registration record as recited in claim 1. The kill request of Dean et al. includes only the client generated signature. As such, there is simply no teaching or suggestion in Dean et al. of including the allocated pair with the identification and the identification signature in the kill call message. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn because Dean et al. does not teach or suggest each

feature of claims 1, 19, 20 and 21 and hence, dependent claim 2 and 6 thereon. Claims 9 and 15 have been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 9 and 15 is moot.

Claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dean et al. in view of well known prior art. Claims 3-5 are dependent on claim 1 and includes all of the features recited in claim 1. The “well known prior art” cited in the Office Action does not cure the deficiencies of Dean et al. as applied to claim 1 as outlined above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because Dean et al. in combination with the “well known prior art” does not teach or suggest each feature of claims 1 and hence, dependent claim 3-5 thereon.

Claims 7, 8, 10-14, 17 and 18 were rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dean et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,765,105 to Kuriki. Kuriki also fails to cure the deficiencies in Dean et al. as Kuriki does not even suggest sending a detach request including identification and identification signature from a registered terminal to a network, comparing the detached request with a record of registration data of the terminal kept at the network side, and detaching the terminal from the network, if the detached request coincides with the record of registration data as recited in independent claim 1. Instead, Kuriki is primarily directed to a GSM communication system which includes multiple mobile stations that share a single international mobile subscriber identity. When one of the mobile stations generates a call origination or call termination request, the mobile switching center provides the requested service only if

the international mobile subscriber identity and the international mobile equipment identity attached to the mobile station is stored by the mobile switching center. As such, there is no discussion or suggestion in Kuriki of detaching a registered terminal from a network. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Dean et al. nor Kuriki, whether taken singly or combined, teaches or suggests each feature of claim 1 and hence, dependent claim 7 and 8 thereon. Claims 10-14, 17 and 18 have been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 10-14, 17 and 18 is moot.

As noted previously, claims 1-8 and 19-21 recite subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art references cited in the Office Action. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1-8 and 19-21 be allowed and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Arlene P. Neal

Registration No. 43,828

Customer No. 32294

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP

14TH Floor

8000 Towers Crescent Drive

Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700

Telephone: 703-720-7800

Fax: 703-720-7802

APN:lls